

# SUPPLEMENT TO THE MARBLE HILL PRESS.

Terms \$1.00 a Year

Vol. 36.

From Congressman Hensley

To the democratic voters of the 13th Congressional district

I had hoped to be able to return to the district in time to make a thorough campaign before the primary, but it now looks as though I may be unable to do so. I have insisted all along that it is the duty of a member of congress to remain here while important matters are pending, even though his personal fortunes are at stake. Later, if the business here will permit, I shall return home.

The democrats of the district have forgotten that I redeemed the district from a republican after Mr. Robb had lost it. Few democrats thought then that the district could be carried by a democrat that year.

I was not only successful then, but I have carried the district since.

Four years ago I ran almost 1000 votes ahead of President Wilson.

Two years ago when Senator Stone was never stronger throughout the state, I ran almost 1000 votes ahead of him.

I carried the district by 944 votes, and let me inquire right here, where would a democratic candidate for congress have been,

when the votes were counted, had he simply run along with the head of the ticket in that election?

I am sure no democrat finds any fault with my official record and no citizen with my private life. The only complaint comes from those who failed to get jobs. I regret that the jobs could not go around, but I in no sense should be held responsible for that fact. I would have had no opposition just as my colleagues in congress have said, that I should not have had, had it not been for the disappointed job hunters. I shall not name the ones to whom I refer, but my opponents know very well without being more specific, who they are. If I have done my duty and been true and worked hard and held the banner of democracy high up above all others, why should any friend put me down and repudiate me and my services by voting against me, even though others are "willing" to serve the district? Other districts do not change their representatives simply to gratify the ambition of individuals. Speaker Clark would not have been where he is today had it not been for his district standing loyally behind him and for twenty years not even permitting any opposition to him, which gave him an opportunity to devote all his efforts to the service of the country. The speaker has used this argument.

No man should be elected to the house simply to gratify his ambition.

All members should be elected for the good of the country. The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man young enough to learn and to grow with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, sober and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the house. His wide acquaintance with members helps him amazingly in doing things. We live in parlous times. Abraham Lincoln's favorite argument for his own reelection was that it is unwise to swap horses in the middle of the river—which applies to congressmen as well as presidents.

The nation is in the midst of serious conditions, more serious perhaps than ever confronted it before. The president has served the people more truly, patriotically and gloriously than almost any president and no member has been true to him and to the great principles for which he stands than have I. Is there a democrat who wishes to trade President Wilson for a new and untried man? I certainly think not.

In conclusion I most earnestly, but respectfully, ask my friends,

especially those who desire to make no change in the general election, to study my record carefully and if I have been faithful and true to every trust to give me their support for, as you know, the stronger I am in the primary the better my chances will be in the general election. I am especially interested in the various county tickets. The election of a United States senator may depend upon a single district, the election of the greatest president the country has ever had may depend upon the electoral vote of Missouri. I shall be renominated and reelected, and I shall do my utmost in the future, as I have in the past, to serve my people and the country to the very best of my ability, God being my helper.

Thanking all my faithful friends very sincerely, I am,

Yours truly,  
WALTER L. HENSLEY

Order of Publication

In the Circuit Court of Bellinger county, in the state of Missouri, on vacation, to September term, A. D., 1916.

Adam J. Newough, plaintiff,  
against

Wm. R. London and Minnie L. London, his wife, and Henry D. Wilson and Edna Wilson, his wife, and all of the unknown heirs, executors, devisees, donees, administrators, mesne, remote, voluntary, involuntary, grantees of John A. Haines and Joseph Lainfield, deceased, defendants.

State of Missouri, to all of the above named defendants, greeting:

You are hereby notified that the above named plaintiff having day and with the undersigned clerk of the circuit court of Bellinger county, Missouri, in vacation, his petition, duly verified by affidavit, wherein said plaintiff alleges that the defendants were sometime, executors or trustees in the subject matter herein described, and in the said herein described, but that the said plaintiff can not insert the names of all the said said defendants and even of them, from setting up any bill of claim, or in said real estate, adversary to said plaintiff and said action is returned to and立案 on the first day of this regular term of this court being located at the courthouse in the city of Marble Hill in the county of Bellinger in the state of Missouri, on the 11th day of September, 1916, at whom time and place said defendants are required and commanded to be and appear and to plead, answer or demur to plaintiff's said petition, otherwise the defendants, in default of doing the same, shall be deemed to have admitted all the facts and circumstances as contained in said petition, and judgment rendered according to the said petition, however, saving and reserving the names of said defendants and the setting up any claim in title to said real property. The Marble Hill Review, published in the city of Marble Hill in the county of Bellinger and state of Missouri, having been designated by the plaintiff and his attorney of record as the newspaper most likely to give notice in the publication of the pendency of this action, it is further ordered that a copy of this order be published in said newspaper once a week for six consecutive weeks, beginning on the last insertion of said paper in said newspaper, or at least 10 days before the first day of the next regular term of court.

FREDERICK F. MABEY, Clerk of the Circuit Court  
State of Missouri, 1916.

I, Frederick F. Mabey, Clerk of the Circuit Court of the county aforesaid, hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of the original order of publication as the same appears of record in this office.

Thus, the 196 day of July, 1916.

Frederick F. Mabey,  
Clerk of the Circuit Court.

Trusted's Sale

By virtue of a deed of trust executed by Mrs. Wm. McAllister, dated the 1st day of May, 1916, and recorded in Book 88, page 344, one of the land records of Bellinger county, Missouri, note to ascertain the payment of one certain promissory note therein described, which note is past due and unpaid; therefore I, the undersigned trustee, at the request of the legal holder of said note, will on

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 1916  
at the north door of the courthouse in the town of Marble Hill, Bellinger county, Missouri, between the hours of 9 o'clock in the forenoon and 3 o'clock in the afternoon, set at public auction, in the highest bidder for cash, the real estate in said deed of trust described as follows:

A part of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section twenty-six, township twenty-eight, containing forty acres. Also all that part of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section twenty-six, containing twenty acres, that is, so much thereof as lies west of the road leading from Jackson to Greenville, and road that was traveled in the fall, A. D., 1856, and bounded as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of said northwest quarter of section twenty-six, containing forty acres. Also all that part of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section twenty-six, containing twenty acres, that is, so much thereof as lies south of the road leading from Jackson to Greenville on said road that was traveled in the fall, A. D., 1856, and bounded as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of

especially those who desire to make no change in the general election, to study my record carefully and if I have been faithful and true to every trust to give me their support for, as you know, the stronger I am in the primary the better my chances will be in the general election. I am especially interested in the various county tickets. The election of a United States senator may depend upon a single district, the election of the greatest president the country has ever had may depend upon the electoral vote of Missouri. I shall be renominated and reelected, and I shall do my utmost in the future, as I have in the past, to serve my people and the country to the very best of my ability, God being my helper.

Will be held on the streets of the town AUGUST 11 and 12. Every effort is being made to make this a bigger and better picnic than any we have ever held before.

THIRTY-SIXTH YEAR.

Marble Hill, Missouri, Thursday, July 20, 1916.

Circulation, 1,200

No. 12.

## Lutesville's Big Annual Picnic

Will be held on the streets of the town AUGUST 11 and 12. Every effort is being made to make this a bigger and better picnic than any we have ever held before.

WATCH FOR THE BIG POSTERS

circuit court of the county aforesaid, hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of the original order of publication as the same appears of record in this office.

Thus, the 196 day of July, 1916.

Enforcing P. Mabey,  
Clerk of the Circuit Court.

Order of Publication

STATE of Missouri, 1916.

County of Bellinger, 1916.

In the Circuit Court of Bellinger county, September term, 1916.

Riley Russell, plaintiff,

Mary Russel, defendant.

The State of Missouri, to all of the

above named defendants, greeting:

Now, on the 10th day of July 1916, for the Superior Court of Bellinger county, Missouri, nunc pro tunc, herein by attorney of record herein before the sketch of such suit was on its half of plaintiff's personal and affiant in suit herein, among other matters, action alleging:

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

Whereupon it is ordered by the court of the county aforesaid that the above named plaintiff may sue and be sued in this court, the defendant, Mary Russell, a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.

That said defendant, Mary Russell, is a nonresident of the state of Missouri, and that the ordinary process of law cannot be served upon her within this state, and it appearing to the satisfaction of this court that the defendant cannot be summoned in this action.